

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are in this application.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 25, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,668,890 to Winkelman.

Independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

“...input variable processing means for performing processing, variably according to the **type of input device** selected from said plurality of types of input devices, on the information data received from said plurality of types of input devices via said input interface means.” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

Accordingly, the data processing apparatus of claim 1 may process information data according to the **type of input device**.

In explaining the above 102 rejection, the Examiner appeared to rely on Fig. 1, elements 8 and 8c, and column 2, lines 52-55 of Winkleman to teach the variable processing means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Winkleman as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter merely “Winkleman”) do not appear to teach the above-recited portion of claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

That is, although Winkleman may utilize a variable processing means, such processing means does not perform variable processing according to the type of input device. In Winkleman, “image values” are loaded into master analysis unit 8c where they are investigated according to mathematical and statistical methods. The results are used to derive image parameters which are used by image processing unit 8 to process image data. (See column 5, lines 45-56 of Winkleman.) Accordingly, Winkleman appears to process data based on **image values** and not the **type of input device** as in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Winkleman.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, independent claims 14-16, 23-25, 28, and 29 are believed to be distinguishable from Winkleman.

Claims 4, 8, and 12 depend from claim 1, and due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Winkleman.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,668,890 to Winkleman in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,050 to Sakarda.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 depend from one of claims 1, 16, and 25, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Winkleman. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Sakarda to overcome the above-described deficiency of Winkleman. Accordingly, claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 are believed to be distinguishable over the applied combination of Winkleman and Sakarda for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 7, 11, 13, 22, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,668,890 to Winkelman.

Claims 7, 11, 13, 22, and 27 depend from one of claims 1, 16, and 25, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Winkleman for at least the reasons previously described.

The Examiner made of record, but did not rely upon, a number of documents. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's explicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.


In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800